



CAL POLY

A c a d e m i c   S e n a t e

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo, California 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE

805.756.1258

## MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, October 7, 2008

UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- 3:10 I. Minutes: none.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
- Regular reports:
- A. Academic Senate Chair:
  - B. President's Office:
  - C. Provost:
  - D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
  - E. Statewide Senate:
  - F. CFA Campus President:
  - G. ASI Representative:
- Special report(s):
- 3:45 **Chair presentation: "A Primer on the Academic Senate"** (See materials sent with agenda. Please bring materials to the meeting.)
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
- 4:15 A. **Resolution on Master of Arts in Biological Sciences:** Hannings, chair of Curriculum Committee/Kitts, Biological Sciences, first reading (pp. 2-5).
- B. **Resolution on Policy Concerning Periodic Evaluation and Performance Review of College Deans:** Foroohar, chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 6-11).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
- 5:00 VII. Adjournment:

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS- \_\_\_\_-08**

**RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED NEW DEGREE PROGRAM  
FOR MASTER OF ARTS IN BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES**

- 1 WHEREAS, The Biological Sciences Department has a Master's of Science program in  
2 Biological Sciences with both thesis and non-thesis options; and  
3  
4 WHEREAS, Program reviews in 1995 and 2005 suggested the non-thesis option be replaced  
5 with a separate Master of Arts in Biological Sciences; and  
6  
7 WHEREAS, The current program for the Master's of Science in Biological Sciences is being  
8 modified to be a thesis-only degree; and  
9  
10 WHEREAS, The Biological Sciences Department is proposing to create a master of arts  
11 program made up of coursework and a comprehensive exam as the culminating  
12 experience; and  
13  
14 WHEREAS, The College of Science and Mathematics Curriculum Committee and the Academic  
15 Senate Curriculum Committee have carefully evaluated this proposal and  
16 recommend its approval; therefore be it  
17  
18 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the proposal for a Master of Arts  
19 in Biological Sciences and that the proposal be sent to the Chancellor's Office for  
20 final approval.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee  
Date: September 12, 2008

## **Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo**

### **Summary Statement of Proposed New Degree Program for Academic Senate**

#### **1. Title of Proposed Program.**

Master of Arts in Biology

#### **2. Reason for Proposing the Program.**

The last two academic program reviews of the MS Biology (1995 and 2005) suggested the creation of a MA program to replace the non-thesis option in the MS program. The current MS program is being amended to a thesis only degree (see attached curriculum requirements for both MA and MS programs). The proposed MA program will be a coursework-based degree that does not require a research-based thesis and the culminating experience will be a comprehensive written exam covering three areas of biology.

The common interpretation of an MS degree is that of a research thesis-driven degree. By removing the non-thesis option we are making a clear distinction between a thesis-based degree (MS) and a coursework-based degree (MA). By creating a new degree we will be able to specifically recruit students for this MA degree because it is designed to allow interdisciplinary study (more units taken outside of the department) and flexibility of focus for career goals.

We expect the MA program will be most useful for students wishing to enhance a career in teaching biological sciences primarily at the middle school, secondary school, or community college levels and for current teachers who want to move into higher paid positions. It will also be useful for students with career plans in industry and/or civil service where a Master's degree commands a higher starting salary.

#### **3. Anticipated Student Demand.**

Over the last ten years, 20 to 30% of our MS students have graduated with the non-thesis option. Incoming classes have averaged between 10 and 20 students with between two to six students choosing the non-thesis program. There are currently 44 active students in the MS Biology program, seven of whom have declared for the non-thesis track. Three non-thesis track students graduated in June 2008. It is expected that the creation of a separate MA degree will enhance our ability to increase overall enrollment since the difference between the two programs will be clearly defined, thus making each more desirable to the appropriate prospective students.

#### **4. Indicate the kind of resource assessment used by the campus in determining to place the program on the academic plan. If additional resources will be required, the summary should indicate the extent of university commitment to allocate them and evidence that campus decision-making committees were aware of the sources of resource support when they endorsed the proposal.**



All of the faculty currently in the Biological Sciences Department will be involved in this program, just as they are in the current MS<sup>4</sup> program. Current space, facilities, library resources, and academic technology and equipment that support the existing MS program will be available to the proposed MA program. No additional faculty or resources will be needed for the MA Biology program.

**5. If the program is occupational or professional, summarize evidence of need for graduates with this specific education background.**

Not applicable.

**6. If the new program is currently a concentration or specialization, include a brief rationale for conversion.**

Not applicable.

**7. If the new program is not commonly offered as a bachelor's or master's degree, provide compelling rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major which has potential value for students. If the new program does not appear to conform to the Trustee policy calling for "broadly based programs," provide rationale:**

The Master of Arts in Biology is a commonly offered program.

**8. Briefly describe how the new program fits with the campus mission.**

*Cal Poly Mission Statement.* Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment where students and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.

The MA in Biology program is closely aligned with the university's mission. The program is poised to encourage co-curricular experiences with a teaching credential. The inclusion of a project also ensures a hands-on application of knowledge and the additional elective units provide room for students to tailor their program to meet cross-disciplinary aspirations.

## CURRICULUM FOR MA BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

*Units*

<b>Required courses</b> .....	19
BIO 501 Molecular and Cellular Biology (4)	
BIO 502 Biology of Organisms (4)	
BIO 503 Population Biology (4)	
BIO 590 Seminar in Biology (3)	
BIO 500 Individual Study (4)	
<b>Electives</b> .....	26
Additional units at the 400 or 500 level. At least 11 units must be 500-level.	
<b>Culminating experience:</b> Satisfactory completion of the comprehensive examinations.	
	<hr/> 45

## CURRICULUM FOR MS BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

*Units*

<b>Required courses</b> .....	27
BIO 501 Molecular and Cellular Biology (4)	
BIO 502 Biology of Organisms (4)	
BIO 503 Population Biology (4)	
BIO 561 Proposal Writing for Bio Research (3)	
BIO 590 Seminar in Biology (3)	
BIO 599 Thesis, including oral defense of thesis (3) (3) (3)	
<b>Electives</b> .....	18
Additional units at the 400 or 500 level. At least 3 units must be 500-level.	
	<hr/> 45

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-\_\_-08**

**RESOLUTION ON  
*POLICY CONCERNING PERIODIC EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE  
REVIEW OF COLLEGE DEANS***

- 1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached *Policy Concerning*  
2 *Periodic Evaluation and Performance Review of College Deans* drafted by the  
3 Faculty Affairs Committee.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee  
Date: February 17, 2008  
Revised: September 30, 2008

## **POLICY CONCERNING PERIODIC EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF COLLEGE DEANS**

### **1. Purpose**

Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews of college deans are designed to renew the understandings among the various constituencies of a college regarding a dean's leadership, conduct of office, establishment of objectives and attainment of administrative goals. The review process shall represent a cooperative effort by representatives from faculty, students, staff and administration. These evaluations and reviews are regarded as constructive and are designed to maintain a sense of collegiality among all persons directly involved with the review process for the dean.

### **2. Scheduling**

Scheduling of all Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews of college deans shall be the responsibility of the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.

#### **A. Periodic Evaluation**

A Periodic Evaluation of college deans shall be conducted every year by tenured faculty, probationary tenure-track faculty, full-time lecturers (with 12.12 appointments in the same college) and permanent staff. Special questionnaires for faculty and support staff, prepared by the Review Panel, and approved by the Provost, will be used for the annual Periodic Evaluation of College Deans and the results will be computed and added to the Dean's personnel file. The current evaluation form "Annual Evaluation of Academic Deans" will be used until it is revised by the Review Panel.

#### **B. Performance Review**

In addition to the annual Periodic Evaluations, a Performance Review of each college deans will be conducted at least every three years. Approximately one-third of the college deans should be scheduled for Performance Review each year.

Special requests for early Performance Reviews shall be approved by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. Circumstances warranting a special request must be compelling. Special requests shall be made in writing to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and shall state clearly and in detail the specific reason(s) for the request.

### **3. Review Panel**

#### **3.1 General Provisions**

The Review Panel shall be representative of constituencies within the college. Normally the Review Panel shall consist of seven (7) members from the college. Small colleges and the library may have fewer than seven members.

The Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel and other appropriate administrative personnel from Academic Affairs may serve as non-voting members and resource persons for the Review Panel.



### **3.2 Review Panel Selection**

- 3.2.1.** Up to five full-time faculty members (tenured, probationary tenure-track or full time lecturers with 12.12 appointments in the same college) shall be elected from the college whose dean is to be reviewed. No more than one faculty member shall be elected from any department or administrative area unless full membership on the Review Panel cannot be achieved with this limitation. The panel may include no more than one full-time lecturer (with 12.12 appointment), no more than one probationary tenure-track faculty, and no more than one department chair/head. The majority of faculty members on the Review Panel shall be tenured faculty.

Elections for these positions shall be conducted by the Academic Senate Office. All full time faculty (tenured, probationary tenure-track and lecturers with 12.12 appointments in the same college) are eligible to vote.

- 3.2.2** Up to two (2) non-academic staff members who have permanent status within the college whose dean is to be reviewed and who do not directly report to the dean shall be elected by all non-academic staff members who have permanent status.

## **4. Responsibilities of the Review Panel**

### **4.1 General Provisions**

The Review Panel shall consider diverse educational philosophies within the college; interpret the objectives, goals and expectations for leadership and management within the constituencies of the college; assess the strengths as well as the weaknesses of the performance of the dean as the chief administrative officer of the college; and evaluate the overall effectiveness of the operation of the college within the university.

### **4.2 Areas of Evaluations**

To assist the Review Panel in its deliberation, the following items are suggested for consideration. These suggestions should not be taken as limiting, definitive or prescriptive. During the process of review, the Panel may find areas to be reviewed not specifically noted here. The Review Panel shall remain free to expand, select from, add to or condense this list of suggestions as appropriate to the college whose dean is to be reviewed.

#### **4.2.1 Leadership**

Does the dean provide intellectual leadership in support of the teacher-scholar model including teaching excellence, creative scholarship, and research? Does the dean foster confidence, trust and respect in the area of leadership? Considerations here might include such items as providing vision and direction for the college, availability for assistance and consultation, fairness and honesty in dealing with problems, resolution of conflicts, and other items of a general nature related to leadership.



**4.2.2 Fiscal Management**

Does the dean maintain and openly communicate the fiscal affairs of the college? Considerations here might include items such as preparation and maintenance of the budget, allocation and expenditure of funds, including college based fees, appropriate purchases and/or repair of equipment, and handling of special money allocation.

**4.2.3 Instruction**

Does the dean maintain appropriate curriculum standards within the college? Considerations here might include items such as establishment of appropriate educational policies, assistance in curriculum development, quality control of instruction, and other items related to curriculum and instruction.

**4.2.4 Faculty Relations**

Does the dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with the faculty within the college? Considerations here might include items such as consultative and collegial decision making, performance reviews or periodic evaluations, recruiting and retaining high quality faculty, fairness in workload allocation, overall protection of faculty against excessive workload, fostering diversity, conflict resolution, faculty professional development, and other items related to the faculty of the college.

**4.2.5 Student Relationships**

Does the dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with students? Considerations here might include items such as resolution of registration problems and practices, acceptable handling of complaints, involvement in outreach programs, encouragement of student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, availability for advisement and consultation, student development beyond the classroom, fostering diversity in the student body, and other items appropriately related to students.

**4.2.6 Staff Relationships**

Does the dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with the members of the non-academic staff of the college? Considerations here might include items such as recruiting practices, fostering diversity, appropriate work assignments, performance reviews and evaluations, in range progression, disciplinary or removal procedures, and other items related to non-academic staff.

**4.2.7 Administrative items**

Does the dean handle the administrative affairs of the college in an appropriately professional manner? Consideration here might be items such as relationships with department/administrative area chairpersons, associate/assistant dean (s), interactions with other deans and administrators, and other items which are related to the administration of the college.

**4.2.8 Office Management**

Does the dean maintain a current knowledge of relevant policies and procedures, follow them appropriately, and ensure that functions of the office are carried out in an orderly and organized manner? This includes, but is not limited to, the office organizational structure, allocation of responsibilities and feed back on performance of the support staff and associate/assistant dean (s).

**4.2.9 Advancement**

Does the dean develop and maintain appropriate professional relationships with alumni and key supporters of the college? Considerations here might include items such as: fund-raising efforts and results, support of departmental efforts in advancement, development of college advancement goals in consultation with college faculty periodic updates on college advancement activities and achievements, and other items appropriately related to the advancement activities of the college.

**5. The Review Panel will be charged with the following responsibilities:**

- 5.1** Meet with the Provost to be briefed on the procedures to be used in the review process as outlined in this document, the time frame for conducting the review, and details about the position under review.
- 5.2** Elect the chair of the Review Panel.
- 5.3** Review specific material developed by the dean under review and meet with the dean to discuss the review process. The dean should provide the Review Panel with a self-study to include:
  - (a) A listing and brief narrative of primary areas of administrative responsibility since recruitment or last review.
  - (b) A listing and brief narrative of the most significant achievements as a dean since appointment or last review.
  - (c) A listing and brief narrative of major goals for the college during the next three years.
  - (d) A listing and brief narrative of competencies which the college dean would like to strengthen or develop.
  - (e) A response to the prior Review Panel recommendations.
  - (f) A list of names or constituencies that can be surveyed or contacted as the Review Panel deems desirable.



- 5.4** Acquire additional information and comments from those who have direct knowledge of the dean's work, such as administrators/managers, faculty, staff, students and off campus constituencies. In cases where student input is appropriate, the Review Panel shall invite the president of the student council of the college, or the ASI president, to suggest ways of soliciting student input in the reviews.
- 5.5** Following the collection of information, the Review Panel will analyze the information, including periodic evaluations, and prepare a preliminary report, which shall contain the following:
- (a) An executive summary.
  - (b) An analysis of the college dean's self-study (Section 5.3).
  - (c) An analysis of the annual periodic evaluations.
  - (d) An analysis of all other information obtained from sources mentioned in Section 5.4.
  - (e) A comparison of accomplishments to goals.
  - (f) Recommendations concerning changes the college dean should undertake with respect to all of the areas evaluated in Section 4.2.
- 5.6** The preliminary report shall be provided to the dean. The dean shall have two weeks to provide a written response to the Review Panel and/or meet with the Review Panel prior to the final report submission to the Provost. The Review Panel shall consider the dean's comments prior to finalizing the report.
- 5.7** A final report by the Review Panel shall go forward to the Provost and to the dean, with a copy to the President.
- 5.8** The dean shall have an opportunity to provide the Provost with a written response to the final report within two weeks.
- 5.9** The dean shall prepare a three-year plan in response to her or his discussions with the Provost regarding the Review Panel's findings and recommendations.
- 5.10** The Provost shall arrange one or more meetings to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Review Panel. The Provost shall invite faculty, students, staff, administrators and others directly involved in the review. Copies of the report and the dean's plan shall be made available by the Provost.